<div align="center">REMARKS/ARGUMENTS</div>

Claims 1-2, 4-7, and 9-23, 25, and 27 are pending in the application. Applicant, by this paper, amends claims 1, 4, 9-11, 14, 18, 22, and 25. Applicant cancels claims 24 and 26 without prejudice to further prosecute the subject matter of the claims. Applicant adds new claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims in light of the amendments and the discussion presented below.

Discussion of Prior Amendments

Applicant understands that the Examiner has entered the amendments submitted in Applicant's Response, filed January 18, 2007, as indicated in the Advisory Action dated January 30, 2007. Applicant requests entry of the prior amendment, dated January 18, 2007, if the amendment has not previously been entered.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 4, 9-17, and 20-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant amends claim 4 to delete the term "a subset."

Although Applicant believes that the Specification, as filed, supports the use of "chip identification," Applicant amends the claims to further prosecution of the application to condition for allowance. Applicant amends claims 9-11, 14, 22, and 25 to delete the reference to "identification of the chip," "chip identification value," and "chip value."

Applicant amends the claims to refer instead to "chip slicer decisions." Support for the claim language is provided in paragraph [40]. *Specification*, at paragraph [40], ("The feed back filter 72 comprises a series of tap contents that each contain **decisions from the slicer 62**.") (*emphasis added*). *See, also, id.*, at paragraph [43], ("the effects of DFE error propagation can be reduced by improving the reliability of **slicer decisions** that are stored in the tap contents of the feed back filter 72.") (*emphasis added*).

The term "one or more" is deleted from claims 9 and 14.

Applicant believes that the amendments to the claims delete all references to the terms identified by the Examiner as the basis for the §112, first paragraph, rejection. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Discussion of Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-14, 16-22, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,273 to Webster et al. (hereinafter Webster).

In order for a claim to be anticipated by a reference, the single prior art reference must describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in the claim. The Examiner contends that Webster sets forth each and every element of the rejected claims.

Claim 1 recites a method for improved digital communications. The method includes "modifying a previous chip slice decision based on the sliced chip and a correlation among the chips in the code word." Support for the claim language can be found, for example, at paragraph [42] ("the known correlation between the chips in the code word can be exploited to modify the older tap contents in the feed back filter 72.").

This feature is not taught nor suggested by Webster. As discussed in Applicant's prior response, Webster fails to describe any element that determines an estimate of a sliced chip based on a correlation among chips in a codeword. *See, Applicant's Response*, filed January 18, 2007, at pages 10-11. Furthermore, Webster fails to describe "modifying a previous chip slice decision based on the sliced chip and a correlation among the chips in the code word." Webster fails to relate any correlation among chips in a code word to previous chip slice decisions. Indeed, Webster fails to describe modifying any previous chip slice decision, much less modifying the previous chip slice decision based on a correlation.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, because Webster fails to describe every element of the claim in the manner set forth in the claim.

Claims 9, 14, 18, 22 and 25 include similar features to those discussed above in relation to claim 1. Claim 9 includes the feature of "a content register storing a previous chip slicer decision is modified based on a correlation of chips in the code word." Claim 14 includes the feature of " a content register in the feedback filter storing a previous chip slicer decision is modified based on a correlation of chips in the code word." Claim 18 includes the feature of "a previous sliced chip modified based on a correlation of the sliced chip with the previous sliced chip." Claim 22 includes the feature of "modifying a previous sliced chip decision based in part on a correlation among the plurality of chips in the codeword." Claim 25 includes the feature of "a content register of the feedback filter is modified based on a correlation between chips of the code word." Each of claims 9, 14, 18, 22, and 25 is believed to be allowable over Webster for at least the reasons presented above in relation to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 9, 14, 18, 22 and 25, because Webster fails to describe every element of the claims in the manner set forth in the claims.

Claims 2, 4-7, 10-13, 15-17, 19-21, and 23 depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 1, 9, 14, 18, 22, or 25 and are believed to be allowable at least for the reason that they depend from an allowable base claim.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

<u>Discussion of New Claim</u>

Claim 27 recites a system for improved digital communications. The system is described in Applicant's Specification in relation to Figures 2 and 4. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claim 27.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application and all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests further examination, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 17-0026. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account. Applicants therefore respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____April 20, 2007_____   By: _____\Howard H. Seo_____
                                                   Howard H. Seo
                                                   Attorney for Applicant
                                                   Registration No. 43,106

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121-2779
Telephone: (858) 651-8546
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502
61017777 v1